



STATE OF IOWA

TERRY E. BRANSTAD
GOVERNOR

KIM REYNOLDS
LT. GOVERNOR

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
MARK J. SCHOUTEN, HOMELAND SECURITY ADVISOR
AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR

STATEWIDE MASS NOTIFICATION, RFP 583-2014-01

The Iowa Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management issued Request for Proposal HSEMD-583-2014-01 on Dec. 13, 2013. As part of this RFP, potential contractors are allowed to provide questions and requests for clarification. These items were due to the Department on Jan. 3, 2014, with the Department posting replies by Jan. 10.

For the purpose of this document, the Department has edited the received questions for clarity and combined similar questions.

Proposals in response to this RFP are due to the Department by 3 p.m. Feb. 3, 2014.

Q: Is the preference of Iowa to purchase server(s) that you would operate yourself?

A: No

Q: Or is the preference to have a third party provider operate this as a service on behalf of Iowa?

A: Yes

Q: As I understand that most of the larger Iowa counties have procured systems already, how many residents would be notified under this system when there is an emergency or non-emergency from the state?

A: As we envision a statewide system for possible use by all counties, it would have the potential to reach out to 3.1 million citizens

Q: Will the State consider allowing the Contractor to utilize their Sub-Contractor customer references and project experience to satisfy the requirements in Sections 3.2.6.5 and 4.3.6.?

A: Yes

Q: Will the State of Iowa provide the customer data or does the state expect the vendor to provide a subscription with customer data?

A: State expects vendor to gather customer data via subscription process

Q: Assuming that the vendor will provide a subscription with recipient customer data, how often is the vendor expected to update the data, Monthly, Quarterly, Yearly?

A: Yearly

Q: Does the State of Iowa need the ability to offer fully partitioned and customizable database instances for each individual county and city which would allow for the full partitioning of recipient data, full customization of caller id's, message content and templates and group administration?

A: Yes

Q: Does the State Of Iowa intend to specifically, at the agency level, send additional non-emergency messages from departments (ex. Police, Water, Parks & Rec.) such as water shut off notifications, warrant reminders, festival information?

A: Yes, the present vision is for non-emergency messages to be public safety oriented.

Q: In addition to evaluating the number of calls launched during an event, will the state also evaluate the time it takes for the citizen to receive the message?

A: Yes

Q: Will the state require individual called IDs for each city, county and agency? EX. Dubuque County, City of Des Moines, Des Moines Police Department?

A: State expects unique caller IDs to be generated in accordance with requirement 4.3.1.44.

Q: Does the County require a system for Emergency Only use or a system for Emergency Notifications and Citizen Outreach messaging such as parades, street closures, and court appearances?

A: Both emergency notifications and community outreach focused on public safety messages

Q: Can you please provide some examples of community information messages?

A: Boil orders, impending weather, and school closings.

Q: Does the state desire a system with fully unlimited use for emergency and non-emergency notifications at a fixed price or is the state going to consider two separate proposals for emergency and non-emergency?

A: The state will consider other pricing models beyond unlimited use in accordance with 4.3.3.3

Q: Does the state want automated weather alerts included in the proposal?

A: Yes, as part of the user opt in/registration process.

Q: Can the City provide details of their last 12 month usage of their current alert notification system, number of calls, emergency or outreach messaging?

A: The state is unable to provide this data as we are not the owner of those systems.

Q: Does the state envision that Collaborative Operating Group to Collaborative Operating Group (COG to COG) is part full IPAWS compliance?

A: Yes

Q: With regard to 4.3.1.5 regarding sending notification for multiple events, is this for concurrent or stacked events?

A: Concurrent events

Q: To maintain accuracy and consistency with questions #15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35 and 36, is native ESRI format required for all mapping application and interfaces? Will third party mapping software or services, other than ESRI, be accepted?

A: Third party mapping software or services will be accepted and evaluated.

Q: Is requirement #22 a two part requirement or are is each element a separate requirement? (System shall support the ability to search for a geographic location using a contact name, address, street segments, zip code, and latitude/longitude.)

A: #22 should be considered to be two unique requirements.

Q: To prevent truncated messages and maximize allowable content, the State should reconsider requirement #40 and allow an efficient method of entering or selecting specific messages for multiple delivery options. (#40 The System shall allow a single message body to be delivered to all types of devices. Voice devices and text devices will not require separate message bodies to be created in separate boxes.)

A: The state is open to allowing more than one message body as a possible delivery method. However, the state still desires to have requirement as listed in 40.

Q: Due to the technical nature of this RFP, and the holidays impacting some of the work days, will the State consider extending the due date from Feb. 3rd to late February?

A: No extension will made to the due date.